about $150 for each soldier, and in New York it was more than $180 for each.

À propos of the large volunteer force added to the Union army from the Southern and Border slave States, I must not omit reference to the gallant and meritorious officers of Southern lineage, or who resided in Border slave, or Southern States, and became conspicuous in the cause of the Union. Without the tedious enumeration of those of lower rank, I would mention the names of Generals Fremont, Buell, Sykes, Reno, Newton, Reynolds, Canby, Ord, Brannan, Nelson, Crittenden, Blair, Sanders, Johnson, Wood, Buford, Terrill, Graham, Davidson, Cook, Alexander, Getty, French, Pope, Hunter, Gillem, Brownlow, and Carter (since retired as Rear Admiral, U. S. N.),* and lastly, but not least, or even second to any Federal general, George H. Thomas. Also, with exceptional pride as a Tennesseean, I will add the distinguished name of Admiral Farragut. Nor should the name of General Scott be omitted from the list, for, although disqualified for active service by reason of his advanced age, yet the moral force and effect of his loyal devotion to the Union cause cannot be overestimated.

Without the conservative Union element of the Southern and Border slave States the dismemberment of the Federal Union would have been inevitable; and had it not been for the conservative stand taken by the Union Democrats of East Tennessee and other portions of the South at the close of the war, the condition of the ex-Confederates would have been miserable beyond measure. Disfranchised, their property taken, and they themselves pursued as political outlaws and traitors, thousands of those who had but lately been arrayed against them in deadly conflict, stood like a break-water between them and utter and unutterable ruin, and this, too, without any hope or expectation of reward from any source. Thus it will be seen that these loyal friends of the National Government were as generous in peace as they had been brave in battle. The country, therefore, owes much to the Union sentiment at the South, and ex-Confederates are under an infinite obligation to the brave and unselfish Unionists who, unable to indorse the proscriptive policy of the dominant majority, met their "enemy in the gates," and, placing themselves in a hopeless minority, advocated their civil and political rights at a time when they were deprived of both.

FELIX A. REEVE.

II.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.

IN his admirable article on Arbitration, in the October number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Prof. Richard T. Ely says:

"Arbitration appears so natural that one would imagine *a priori* it must ever have been an accompaniment of the wages system of modern times. Yet such has not been the case."

* Carter was a loyal East Tennesseean, who, at the beginning of the war, resigned his rank in the navy, and was appointed Brigadier-General of Volunteers. At the close of the war he returned to the naval service.

He further says:

"A permanent 'Board of Arbitration and Conciliation' was first established in Nottingham, England, in 1860, in the glove and hosiery trade."

As a wrong inference respecting the novelty of arbitration might possibly be drawn from these statements, I venture to cite a few facts that bear on the subject, and show the new departure in the adjustment of industrial struggles and differences to have been made, in England at least, much earlier than 1860. Without any desire to strain the point, I would remind your readers that at so remote a time as the reign of Edward III. laws were passed to regulate wages, thus taking the question out of the control of either masters or men. The Court, indeed, was made the arbitrator. Anticipatory of just such a state of affairs as now prevails in Charleston, a special Royal Order, issued in 1362, after a great storm, provided that the wages of roofers were not to be enhanced by reason of the damage done. This is, in its essence, arbitration on wages, by a third party, and is the fairer because it is not forgetful of the unprotected public. The main principle comes out even more clearly in an ordinance of the city of London, passed in 1350, wherein it is set up as a rule that "from henceforth, if there be any dispute moved between any master and his men in the said trade, such dispute shall be settled by the warden of the trade." Here are the primal, evolutionary stages of the arbitration of to-day. Again, by the statute of apprentices, 5 Elizabeth. c. 4, wages were to be assessed yearly by the justices of the peace, who were to settle all disputes between masters and apprentices, and to guard the interests of the latter. An Act of James I. increased the powers of the justices in this direction. They were now authorized to fix the rates of remuneration so as to "yield unto the hired person, both in the time of scarcity and in the time of plenty, a convenient proportion of wages." I believe that the discontinuance of this oft-enacted legal arbitration—little as it may accord with our modern ideas of *laissez faire*—led more than once to the labor agitations of which strikes and lockouts are to-day the sequence and the representatives.

With regard to the second statement, quoted above from Prof. Ely's article, it may be noted that a voluntary court of arbitration was established at Macclesfield, England, in 1849, by the silk manufacturers and weavers. It was called "The Macclesfield Silk Trade Board." It comprised twelve manufacturers and twelve weavers, as well as a chairman and a secretary, who were not members. The effort after peaceful arbitrament failed; but we need not be surprised, in view of the fact that strikes were approved as a coercive measure by both parties, and that, in case of a strike, some of the manufacturers went the length of collecting funds to help bring their fellow employer, in revolt, to submission. Still the board lasted four years, and did good work. In the London printing trade, a board of arbitration was formed about 1853. It consisted of three master printers and three compositors, and a barrister as umpire. The court sat only on occasion. In neither instance, it is true, was the court or board "permanent," but each had a useful term of existence, and antedated the board of 1860. I might go further back than 1849, and recall the special report on labor, made to Parliament by a committee in 1824, in which it was said to be proven "that *the practice of settling disputes by arbitration* between masters

and workmen *has been attended with good effects*, and it is desirable that the laws which direct and regulate arbitration should be consolidated, amended, and made applicable to all trades." As one immediate effect of the report, came the Act of George IV., of 1824, making some very broad and liberal provisions for arbitration and for the appointment of referees. Unfortunately, the Act did not seek to establish permanent boards, which Prof. Ely regards wisely as "one condition of the largest measure of success," though he does not favor governmental interference in the matter to any great extent. Is public opinion sufficiently authoritative to enforce its conclusions, against industrial warfare and in support of arbitration, without the help of law?

THOMAS COMMERFORD MARTIN.

III.

ROME OR REASON.

WHEN a great system of theology arrives at that stage of decadence where it feels called upon to apologize for its cruelties and explain away its inconsistencies, it is far past the meridian line, and it does not require a prophet to foretell its future. That the Protestant Church has arrived at this stage no careful observer can doubt. The intellect of this Church has embarked on a sea of apologetics, while the body of the faithful have re-embarked for Rome. It has been well said that, in the Christian religion, there can be no permanent abiding place between Rome and Reason, and the history of the past century, as well as the present attitude of the churches, renders this pregnant alliteration luminous. The farce of "private judgment," which may judge only far enough to become a Protestant, has been played to its last act. The "sacred right of reason," which extends only to the limit of the bishop's capacity, or brings up against the stone wall of an absolute creed, is simply a play upon words and a sop thrown to Cerberus. It deceives only the simple, and is less dignified and infinitely less consistent than the frank, if not altogether complimentary, statements of Rome. In substance, the Pope says: "As a rule you have no intellects worth mentioning. Those of you who are not thus afflicted are forbidden to use the modicum which you do possess. Such scraps of information as I may possess, or as I deem good for the welfare of the Church and on a level with your capacity, I shall impart to you when I see fit. At certain times you will open your mouths and I shall fill them with such food as I have on hand, and you will pay a good price for the same. It may not be what you wanted, and it may not agree with your digestion, but that is no affair of yours. You ought to want nothing else. It is your digestion, and not the food that is out of order. Stale nourishment is good for you. Anything fresh might prove fatal." "What makes you think so, my Lord?" "Excommunicate that questioner," says Rome. "He is a dangerous heretic. He asks questions about spoiled food before he eats it, and he looks sick afterward." Thus was made the first Protestant. But by and by a Protestant came who not only asked questions, but absolutely declined to eat the latest Roman dilution, furnished from Westminster. He preferred strawberries and cream. He was the first Agnostic. As long as berries grow and he is able to milk the Alder-